

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04433 171322Z

47

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01

SAM-01 DRC-01 /152 W

----- 059397

R 171227Z MAY 74

FM ANEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2818

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO

RUF OL/AMEMBASSY BONN 3605

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

C O N F I D E N T I A L VIENNA 4433

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: REPORT OF BILATERAL, 16 MAY
BETWEEN FRG AND SOVIET REPS

FOLLOWING IS MEMO OF BILATERAL MEETING BETWEEN FRG
REP BEHREND AND USSR REP SMIRNOVSKY WHICH WAS CIRCULAED
BY FRG REP 16 MAY AHG MEETING.

BEGIN TEXT.

SUBJECT: MEEING BETWEEN MR. SMIRNOWSKY AND MR. BEHREND

IN A DISCUSSION WHICH I HAD WITH MR. SMIRNOWSKY OVER LUNCH
AT HIS INVITATION ON MAY 14, 1974, MR. SMIRNOWSKY ARGUED
MUCH IN THE SAME WAY AS IN THE SOVIET-AMERICAN MEETING ON
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04433 171322Z

MAY 13, 1974.

HE FOLLOWING REMARKS OF MR. SMIRNOWSKY MAY BE OF SOME INTEREST:

A) SMIRNOWSKY SAID REPEATEDLY THAT IT WAS QUITE UNREALISTIC TO EXPECT THE EAST TO REVISE ITS VIEW THAT ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD REDUCE FROM THE OUTSET. THEY WERE PREPARED TO MAKE AN EXCEPTION FOR LUXEMBOURG; THIS WAS ALREADY A CONSIDERABLE CONCESSION. IN MOSCOW HE WAS TOLD THAT THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT DID NOT SEE MUCH POINT IN DISCUSSING IN THE INFORMAL MEETINGS OVER A LONG TIME THE QUESTION WHOSE FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED FROM THE OUTSET, SINCE ONLY REDUCTIONS OF ALL FROM THE OUTSET WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE. SMIRNOWSKY INDICATED THAT IF THE WEST ACCEPTED THIS PRINCIPLE THEY WOULD FIND THE EAST FLEXIBLE AS TO OTHER ASPECTS.

B) SMIRNOWSKY STATED AT SOME LENGTH THAT THE EAST WOULD ACCEPT NO OTHER METHOD OF REDUCTION BUT EQUAL PERCENTAGE REDUCTIONS. THIS WAS THE ONLY FAIR METHOD. THE WESTERN PHASE I PROPOSAL AND THE COMMON CEILING CONCEPT WHICH ENVISAGED STRONGLY ASYMMETRICAL REDUCTIONS WERE COMPLETELY UNREALISTIC.

C) SMIRNOWSKY AGAIN MAINTAINED THAT THE FIGURE OF 777.000 FOR NATO GROUND FORCES COULD NOT POSSIBLY INCLUDE FRENCH GROUND FORCES STATIONED IN GERMANY. THE EAST DID NOT MIND IF FRENCH FORCES WERE EXCLUDED SINCE FRANCE DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. IF, HOWEVER, THE FRENCH GROUND FORCES IN GERMANY WERE INCLUDED THAN THE FIGURE OF 777.000 WAS DEFINITELY TOO LOW. SMIRNOWSKY ADDED THAT IT WOULD NOT BE FAIR TO INSIST ON THIS POINT AS LONG AS THE EAST HAD NOT INTRODUCED DATA INTO THE NEGOTIATIONS. THIS WOULD BE DONE AT THE RIGHT MOMENT.

D) WHEN I ASKED WHETHER FOR THE SOVIET UNION THE CSCE HAD PRIORITY OVER MBFR, SMIRNOWSKY REPLIED THAT INDEED CSCE WAS AT PRESENT IN THE FOREGROUND OF INTEREST SINCE IT HAD GONE ON FOR SUCH A LONG TIME AND SINCE IT WAS NECESSARY TO BRING PHASE II TO A SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04433 171322Z

E) SMIRNOWSKY COMPLAINED THAT IN VIENNA AS ELSEWHERE THE WEST ALWAYS HAD A COMPLETELY UNREALISTIC OPENING POSITION AND THEN SLOWLY MOVED TO A MORE REALISTIC FALLBACK POSITION WHILE THE EAST ALWAYS STARTED WITH A REALISTIC OPENING POSITION. I TOLD SMIRNOWSKY NOT TO HAVE THE ILLUSION THAT THE WESTERN POSITION WAS JUST AN OPENING GAMBIT. IF THE EAST WAITED FOR A NON-EXISTENT FALLBACK POSITION TO APPEAR, NO PROGRESS WOULD BE POSSIBLE. WHEN I ASKED HIM ABOUT THE

ARTICLE BY WASHIETL IN "DIE PRESSE", REFERRING TO A POSSIBLE NEW EASTERN PROPOSAL, SMIRNOWSKY REPLIED THAT THERE WERE MANY IDEAS FLOATING IN THE AIR. THE SOURCE OF THESE NEWS WAS PROBABLY THE IMAGINATION OF THE AUTHOR.

F) SMIRNOWSKY CONCLUDED FROM MY ARGUMENTS THAT ONE WOULD HAVE TO BE PESSIMISTIC ABOUT THE CHANCES OF PROGRESS. UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES THE SOVIET UNION MIGHT HAVE TO WAIT FOR UNILATERAL REDUCTIONS. WHEN I WARNED HIM AGAINST ILLUSIONS IN THIS RESPECT, HE RETRACTED AND SAID THAT THE SOVIET UNION DID NOT COUNT ON SUCH UNILATERAL REDUCTIONS.HUMES

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MBFR, GROUND FORCES, DIPLOMATIC DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 17 MAY 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974VIENNA04433
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740122-0908
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740536/aaaabgcz.tel
Line Count: 127
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 26 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <26 MAR 2002 by collinp0>; APPROVED <08 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: REPORT OF BILATERAL, 16 MAY BETWEEN FRG AND SOVIET REPS
TAGS: PARM, GE, UR, NATO, (BEHREND), (SMIRNOVSKY)
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005